



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/913,860	09/27/2001	Masataka Masuda	P07340US00/	5469
881 7590 08/19/2008 STITES & HARBISON PLLC 1199 NORTH FAIRFAX STREET SUITE 900 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER NGUYEN, TAM M	
			ART UNIT 1797	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/19/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/913,860

**Applicant(s)**

MASUDA ET AL.

**Examiner**

TAM M. NGUYEN

**Art Unit**

1797

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 May 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 7-16 and 18-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7-16 and 18-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C2)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 7-16 and 18-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP-06-228570 in view of Masuda et al. (6,042,798) and Logsdon et al. (4,876,402).

The JP patent discloses a desulfurization process by contacting a raw hydrocarbon feed comprising methane, ethane, propane, and butane with a catalyst comprising Cu, Zn, and Ni oxide, in the presence of hydrogen. (See paragraphs 0016-0029). When the raw hydrocarbon is a town, the desulfurization step is operated at a pressure of from 1 - 10 kg/cm<sup>2</sup> (1 - 10 atm) and at a temperature of from 280-380° C and the molar ratio of hydrogen to town gas is 0.36. The JP patent also teaches that the zinc oxide acts as desorbent. (See paragraphs 25, 41, 0006, 0025, 0029, and 0030)

The JP patent does not disclose that the desulfurization step is operated at a space velocity (GHSV) of 200 to 10,000 h<sup>-1</sup>. However, Masuda discloses a hydrodesulfurization process wherein the process is operated at a space velocity (GHSV) of about 1,000 h<sup>-1</sup> (See examples). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the process of the JP patent by operating the desulfurization step at a space velocity as taught by the Masuda because such space velocity is known to be effective in a desulfurization process.

The JP patent does not disclose that the desulfurization is formed so that the sulfur content in the town gas is not more than 6 ppb. However, the modified process of the JP patent is similar to the claimed process in terms of feedstock, operating conditions, and catalyst. Therefore, it would be expected that the modified desulfurization process of the JP patent would have the sulfur content in the town gas as claimed.

The JP patent does not disclose a step of making the catalyst as claimed.

Logsdon disclose a process of making a catalyst as claimed. (See entire patent)

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the process of the JP patent by making the catalyst as taught by Logsdon because such method is effective way to produce catalyst.

### ***Response to Arguments***

The argument that the JP '570 reference fails to teach or in any way make obvious the claimed desulfurization agent and the examiner fails to make a prima facie case that the catalyst of the JP '570 reference is equivalent to the claimed desulfurizing agent is not persuasive. The claimed desulfurizing agent has an ability to adsorb sulfur compounds and the desulfurizing agent comprises copper, zinc, and iron and/or nickel. The JP reference teaches that the catalyst comprises metals as claimed and it is also adsorbed sulfur as claimed.

The argument that the JP reference does not teach a method of making a catalyst as claimed whereas Logsdon teaches a method of producing an aldehyde hydrogenation catalyst, not a desulfurization catalyst is not persuasive. The examiner relied upon Logsdon to teach that a method of making a catalyst as claimed is known in the art. One of skill in the art would make the catalyst of the JP reference by any known method including the method that is taught by Logsdon. It is reminded that how a catalyst to be used is not related with how it is made. For example, the catalyst of the JP reference can be used in any hydrogenation process such as hydrogenation of aldehyde, nitrogen, or olefins.

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TAM M. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571)272-1452. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on (571) 272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Tam M. Nguyen  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1797

TN  
/Tam M. Nguyen/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797